REMARKS

Claims 41 and 42 have been amended to correct grammatical errors therein.

Reconsideration is requested.

In the final Office Action, Claims 1-42 were again rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Hansson et al. (US6400942), Hult et al. (US5822700) and Ross et al (US6263212). These references are said to render obvious a method and system as claimed wherein a teleservice payload size indication associated with a network receiving entity is provided from the network receiving entity to a network sending entity during standard registration message exchange. Applicants respectfully traverse.

After careful reading of the grounds for rejection set forth in the final Office Action, and upon further study of Hansson, Hult and Ross, it would appear that the single greatest deficiency of the cited references is that none attempts to transfer (send or receive) any maximum teleservice size information between network entities, and certainly not from a network receiving entity to a network sending entity.

In Hansson et al., there is no discussion as to how the "predetermined number of octets" is provided to the message center for use in determining whether a broadcast message needs to be segmented. There is no mention of this information being transferred from any other entity and it would appear that the information is simply programmed into the message center in advance.

In Hult et al., the load measuring device 40 is an agent of the MSC 30 (a network receiving entity) (column 3, lines 56-65). There is no transfer of message size information from a network receiving entity to a network sending entity. Note that the MC (message center) 20 in Fig. 1 (a network sending entity) is not provided with the results of the size measurement performed by device 40. The MSC 30 keeps this information for its own use.

10

In Ross et al., size information is available in an MSC attribute table (Fig. 7) that is apparently part of the SMSC 50 (a network sending entity). The SMSC has to perform a lookup in this table and doesn't receive any messages from a network receiving entity (column 10, lines 39-46).

The references thus teach away from Applicants' claimed subject matter in which teleservice payload size information is provided automatically from a network receiving entity to a network sending entity. The automated provisioning of payload size information to a network sending entity is simply not contemplated. A fortiori, Applicants' rather elegant use of standard registration messages as a vehicle for imparting payload size information to a network sending entity is nowhere within the contemplation any of the references.

The following dependent claims recite additional elements that are neither disclosed nor suggested by Hansson et al., Hult et al. or Ross et al.:

Claims 2, 12, 22, 32 — the references do not disclose or suggest a system or method wherein a payload size indication is passed during standard registration message exchange from a network receiving entity to a database associated with a mobile station, and wherein the payload size indication is passed during standard registration message exchange from the database to a network sending entity.

Claims 3, 13, 23, 33 — the references do not disclose or suggest a system or method wherein payload size indication is passed during standard registration message exchange from a network receiving entity to a network sending entity.

Claims 9, 19, 29 and 39 — the references do not disclose or suggest a system or method wherein the standard registration message exchange includes one of an Authentication On Initial Access message exchange, a Direct FeatureRequest With Call Routing message exchange, a

11

QualificationRequest message exchange, a RegistrationNotification message exchange, or a TransferToNumberRequest message exchange.

Claims 10, 20, 30 and 40 -- the references do not disclose or suggest a system or method wherein the standard registration message exchange includes one of an SMSNotification message exchange or an SMSRequest message exchange.

As such, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn, and that Notices of Allowability and Allowance be duly issued.

Respectfully submitted,

Walter W. Duft
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 31,948

8616 Main Street, Suite 2
Williamsville, New York 14221
Telephone: (716)

12